

yesterday. Without concerted efforts to address the mental health disorders that affect our children, we may witness more terrifying violence in our schools.

Friday, April 23, 1999 is Children's Memorial Day to commemorate the thousands of children and youth who are killed by violence each year. On that day, the governors of every state have been asked to fly the Children's Memorial Flag.

As chair of the Children's Caucus, I would like to urge my Colleagues to remember Friday as a national day to honor children whose lives have been cut short by violence. I also ask that we pray for the families who have been devastated by the violence of Monday.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

MEDICARE TRUTH IN BILLING ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of hospitals and Medicare beneficiaries across this country who have a vested interest in changing the way the Health Care Finance Administration, HCFA, and its financial intermediaries itemize the explanation of Medicare benefits and Medicare summary notices, both of which are statements each Medicare beneficiary receives from HCFA for services rendered them that they are reimbursed by Medicare.

Unfortunately for hospitals and Medicare beneficiaries, these statements all too often contain inaccurate and misleading information; specifically, information that overstates the amount that Medicare reimburses hospitals for inpatient services, and understates a hospital's contribution to financing any shortfall in Medicare reimbursements for such services; information that clouds the truth for Medicare beneficiaries instead of clarifying the truth.

At a time when hospitals' margins are shrinking due to changes in Medicare reimbursement rates, at a time when hospitals have been plagued by the inappropriate use of the False Claims Act and at a time when the President in his fiscal year 2000 budget has proposed further cuts in Medicare, it is about time that hospitals be given the credit they deserve for financing part of the inpatient expenses as a result of Medicare's underpayment.

Moreover, at a time when seniors are barraged by vague billing information, it is about time that they be given the full truth regarding the amount Medicare reimburses hospitals for services provided them.

I am happy to announce that I have introduced the Truth in Medicare Bill-

ing Act, a measure that will ensure that HCFA reports the correct amount Medicare reimburses hospitals for inpatient services. The Medicare Truth in Billing Act, in addition to requiring HCFA to report the actual amount it reimburses hospitals for inpatient services, will require that HCFA add a line to all Medicare summary statements disclosing the amount equal to the difference between the amount of total inpatient charges incurred and the amount Medicare reimbursed the hospital for those charges.

It is a simple fix to a problem that I believe should be resolved in the very near future.

The initial level of support that the Medicare Truth in Billing Act has received has been tremendous. The measure has been endorsed by the American Hospital Association. In addition, numerous State hospital associations, staff and hospital administrators in my district and throughout the country have contacted my office to express their overwhelming support for the bill. Furthermore, seniors in my district, during my most recent round of town meetings, were very supportive of the measure.

I hope that my colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle will join me in working with the House leadership, the Committee on Ways and Means and its Subcommittee on Health, HCFA, and most importantly, the hospitals and seniors to ensure that the changes set forth in the Medicare Truth in Billing Act will become law.

AIRBUS, THE EUROPEAN AIRCRAFT MANUFACTURER, A COMPANY THAT CANNOT FAIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to bring an important trade issue to the attention of my colleagues. Within the past 2 years, Boeing's share of the aircraft market has fallen from 70 percent to 50 percent. Boeing is losing market shares to Airbus, the European aircraft manufacturer.

Airbus was created in the early 1970s for the sole purpose of maintaining and fostering a European role in the production of large commercial jet aircraft. It is a combination of the major aerospace companies of France, Germany, the United Kingdom and Spain. Airbus, which is 60 percent owned by private companies, is not the property of the four European nations. However, it is still hard to view Airbus as a private business just like any other business.

First of all, Airbus does not operate as a public corporation but, rather, it has special legal status under French law. This special status allows member companies to pool resources without having to disclose specifics about their

combined financial activities. Therefore, Airbus remains a financial mystery.

Also, France still has not completed the privatization of its aerospace firm, Aerospatiale. Given France's long history of substantial support to Aerospatiale, it is hard to believe that the French government will give up complete control of the company any time soon.

Perhaps most importantly, the European Commission has the ability to save Airbus from bankruptcy if the need ever arises. Therefore, Airbus, due to its government backing, is a company that cannot fail. This gives Airbus a tremendous advantage because it has the luxury of making its business decisions with very little risk compared to Boeing, which must defend its business decisions to questioning stockholders, not supportive government officials.

Airbus contends that it has earned its increased market share against Boeing by simply building the type of aircraft the airline industry wants to buy. It is important to note, however, that Airbus' success was achieved with significant governmental assistance. Because Airbus does not publish financial statements, it is difficult to know exactly how much government support it has received over the course of the years. However, it is known that the largest amount of financial support was provided in the 1980s when Airbus launched major development programs for new aircraft such as the A-320, the A-330 and the A-340. Therefore, Airbus was able to make new and different types of aircraft which helped attract new customers only because of increased, direct governmental aid.

Although most of the government aid was in the form of repayable loans, it was still a subsidy because it would have cost Airbus much more to raise money on the private market. It would be nearly impossible for a private company to obtain aircraft development funds at a government borrowing rate. It is true that Airbus must repay the government aid with interest, but only as aircraft are sold. Therefore, there is no risk for Airbus when it develops new products, because if customers do not buy their new product, Airbus does not have to repay the loans.

Again, Airbus, due to its government backing, is a company that cannot fail. It is no wonder that Boeing continues to lose market shares to Airbus. Airbus enjoys a tremendous competitive advantage because of the substantial and direct government aid it receives from four European nations.

Airbus is no longer a young company trying to enter the aircraft market. It is number two in the market and gaining on Boeing each and every day, yet Airbus still relies on substantial government support. This is not right. We should not sit idly by as Boeing continues to lose out simply because it does not enjoy the same protectionist treatment as Airbus.